

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Initially, applicants note that provided with the outstanding Office Action of August 23, 2004, was a form PTO-1449 corresponding to an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed May 7, 2004. It appears that the returned form PTO-1449 inadvertently did not initial reference AW cited in the “Other References” section of that IDS. For convenience, a copy of the returned IDS is provided herewith. Applicants respectfully request confirmation of consideration of that additional reference AW cited on the noted IDS be provided by returning a new initialed form PTO-1449 also initialing consideration of that reference AW.

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by WO 98/16886 to Srivastava et al. (herein “Srivastava”).¹

Addressing the above-noted rejection based on Srivastava, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Initially, applicants note each of the claims is amended by the response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now clarifies that the communication node is “a base station node”, the first network “is a radio network”, and the second network “is a non-radio network”. The other independent claims are similarly amended. Such features are believed to distinguish over the applied art.

In further detail, independent claim 1 recites that a communication node as a base station node recognizes one communication node on a first radio network as one of its own constituent elements (for example a Sub Unit) and discloses its own configuration information to another communication node on a second non-radio network (for example an

¹ Applicants note the statement for the rejection on page 3 of the Office Action cites U.S. patent 5,959,536 as corresponding to the Srivastava reference. However, that reference corresponds to the newly cited patent to Chambers. It appears the basis for the outstanding rejection is only directed to Srivastava in WO 98/16886 based on the statements for the rejection. If applicants’ understanding is wrong, clarification is requested.

IEEE 1394 bus), such that the another communication node on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus) recognizes the one communication node on the first network (radio network) as if it is a constituent element (for example a Sub Unit) of the claimed communication node. In other words, the one communication node is not recognized as existing on the first network, although it is actually on the first network, but instead is viewed as if it is a part of the communication node on the second network.

Similarly to independent claim 1 as noted above, independent claim 8 recites a communication node as a base station node that discloses first configuration information regarding constituent elements (for example Sub Units) in one communication node on a first radio network as its own constituent elements (for example the Sub Units), to another communication node on a second non-radio network (for example an IEEE 1394 bus), and/or discloses second configuration information regarding constituent elements (for example the Sub Units) in the other communication node on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus) as its own constituent element (for example the Sub Units), to the one communication node on the first network (radio network). In other words, the communication node of claim 8 provides configuration information disclosing a function similar to that of the communication node of claim 1, with respect to both communication nodes on both networks.

With respect to independent claim 16, independent claim 16 recites a communication node as a base station node that transfers data to be exchanged between a processing unit and an application executed on another communication node on a second non-radio network (for example an IEEE 1394 bus), through a first interface unit connected to a first radio network, such that the one communication node connected to the first network (the radio network) is handled as if it is connected to the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus). In other words, claim 16 recites a communication node that transfers data to the one

communication node on the first network (radio network), on behalf of an application that is executed at another communication node on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus).

With respect to independent claim 19, independent claim 19 recites a communication network terminal, which is a radio terminal, that communicates with a communication node on a second non-radio network (for example an IEEE 1394 bus), discloses functions in the communication terminal as Sub Units in an AV/C protocol executed on an IEEE 1394 bus, and receives information regarding the Sub Units existing in that communication node on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus), while making a connection to a communication node on a first radio network. In other words, in claim 19 the communication terminal is connected to the first network (the radio network), but is also capable of communicating with a node on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus) through a communication node (e.g. a base station node), by disclosing its own functions as if they are Sub Units on the IEEE 1394 bus.

With respect to independent claim 22, independent claim 22 recites a communication terminal, which is a radio terminal, that communicates with a communication node on a second non-radio network (for example an IEEE 1394 bus) and executes an application on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus), while making a connection to a communication node on a first radio network. In other words, in claim 22 the communication terminal is actually connected to the first network (the radio network), but is also capable of communicating with a node on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus) through a communication node (e.g. a base station node), by executing an application on the second network (non-radio, for example the IEEE 1394 bus) at the communication terminal itself.

Each of the above-noted claims is believed to clearly distinguish over the teachings in Srivastava.

More particularly, Srivastava is directed to task-driven control system for electronic consumer devices. In Srivastava multiple consumer electronic devices are connected together by a control via control lines or cables. Srivastava differs from the claims as Srivastava does not disclose or suggest the specifically claimed operations and connections of the base station node connected between a radio network and a non-radio network, as now clarified in each of the claims. As noted above, in the claims as currently written, the communication node is a base station node, the first network is a radio network, and the second network is a non-radio network. Srivastava does not disclose or suggest any such structures.

Thereby, the claims as currently written are believed to distinguish over the teachings in Srivastava.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
EHK/SNS:aif

I:\ATT\NSNS\0039\00397268\AMD.DUE.2.23.05.doc



COPY

SHEET 1 OF 1

Form PTO 1449 (Modified)		U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE		ATTY DOCKET NO. 0039-7268-2RD	SERIAL NO. 09/343,509	
O I P E LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT MAY 8 7 2004				APPLICANT Yoshiaki TAKABATAKE, et al.		
				FILING DATE June 30, 1999	GROUP 2663	
U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS						
EXAMINER INITIAL	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUB CLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
AA						
AB						
AC						
AD						
AE						
AF						
AG						
AH						
AI						
AJ						
AK						
AL						
AM						
AN						
FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS						
	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	TRANSLATION		
One	AO	JP 10-154996	06-09-1998	YES		NO
AP						
AQ						
AR						
AS						
AT						
AU						
AV						
OTHER REFERENCES (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, etc.)						
AW	Saito, T., et al. "Homenetwork Architecture Considering Digital Home Appliances" Technical Report of IEICE. IN97-128 (1997-11)					
AX						
AY						
AZ	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional References sheet(s) attached					
Examiner	Date Considered 8/9/04					
*Examiner: Initial if reference is considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.						